mies during World War One, being captured by the British in September 1918. During the Arab-Israeli War of 1948, it was the headquarters of Arab forces under Fawzī Ḳāwūkdjī until these were defeated, with the resultant surrender of Nazareth without a fight. Modern Israeli Nazareth is an important market centre for the Arab population of northern Galilee, and is the chef-lieu of the Northern District of Israel. It is also the largest, virtually all-Arab town of Israel, with a population in the 1970 estimate of 34,000, the majority Christian.

Bibliography: Ibn Saʿd, ed. Sachau, i/1, 26; Masʿūdī, i, 123 = § 119; Yāḳūt, iv, 729; Dimashḳī, ed. Mehren, 212; R. Hartmann, *Ḫalīl al-Ẓāhirī's Zubdat Kashf al-Mamālik*, 1907, 47-8; *Die Pilgerfahrt des russischen Abtes Daniel*, tr. Leskien, in *ZDPV*, vii, 17 ff.; Propst, *Die geogr. Verhältnisse Syriens und Palästinas bei Wilhelm Tyr.*, i, 55; Röhricht, *Geschichte des Königr. Jerusalem*, 441, 444, 885, 920 and *passim*; Robinson, *Palästina*, iii, 419 ff.; Sir George Adam Smith, *Historical geography of the Holy Land*, index s.v.; Tobler, *Nazareth in Palästina*, 1868; G. Schumacher, in *ZDPV*, xiii, 235 ff. (with map and photograph); G. Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, London 1890, 301-2; H. C. Luke and E. Keith-Roach, *The handbook of Palestine and Trans-Jordan*, London 1930, 137; Admiralty Handbooks, *Palestine and Transjordan*, London 1943, 333-4, 535-6; A.-S. Marmardji, *Textes géographiques arabes sur la Palestine*, Paris 1951, 116-17, 200-1. (F. BUHL-[C.E. BOSWORTH])

NĀṢIRĀBĀD [see SĪSTĀN].

AL-**NĀṢIRIYYA**, a town of southern modern ʿIrāḳ and the chef-lieu of the governorate of Dhū Ḳār. It is situated on the left bank of the Euphrates, above the Hawr al-Ḥammār of the marshlands [see AL-BAṬĪḤA], some 177 km/110 miles to the northwest of Baṣra (lat. 31°04′N., long. 46°17′E.).

The town was founded *ca.* 1870 by the paramount chief of the Muntafiḳ [*q.v.*] confederation, Nāṣir Saʿdān Pasha, who aided the administration of Midḥat Pasha [*q.v.*] in extending Ottoman Turkish influence over this largely Shīʿī region against local tribal interests. In July 1915 it was captured by British and Indian forces under General G.E. Gorringe. After 1930 it acquired a station on a spur from the Iraq Railways' Baghdād-Baṣra line. The population of the town according to the 1985 estimate was 138,842.

Bibliography: Admiralty Handbook, *Iraq and the Persian Gulf*, London 1944, 547-8; S.H. Longrigg, *ʿIraq 1900 to 1950, a political, social and economic history*, London 1953, index. (ED.)

AL-**NĀṢIRIYYA**, a branch of the Ṣūfī order of the Shādhiliyya [*q.v.*], which originated in southern Morocco, at the *zāwiya* of Tāmgrūt [*q.v.*], which had been founded in 983/1575 by a member of a family of marabouts. The order owes its name to the Ibn Nāṣir family [*q.v.* in Suppl.], who headed the *zāwiya* from the time of the *shaykh* Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn b. Nāṣir b. ʿAmr b. ʿUthmān (1015-85/1603-74), the founder (1070/1660), onwards. It was however his son Aḥmad b. Muḥammad (1057-1129/1647-1717) who was responsible for organising the order.

Bibliography: To the sources cited in IBN NĀṢIR and TAMGRŪT, add in particular, L. Rinn, *Marabouts et khouan*, Algiers 1884; Ch. de Foucauld, *Reconnaissance au Maroc*, Paris 1888; O. Depont and X. Coppolani, *Les confréries religieuses musulmanes*, Algiers 1897, 479; W. Marçais, *Textes arabes de Tanger*, Paris 1911, 133; E. Montet, in *RHR*, xlv, 20-1; E. Lévi-Provençal, *Chorfa*, 99; G.S. Colin, *La zāouia de Tamgrout et les Naciriyine*, in *Rens. coloniaux* (1938), 205-23; L. Massignon, *Annuaire du monde musulman*, ²1955, 257. On a secondary branch, see E. Michaux-Bellaire, *La zaouia d'Ahançal*, in *Arch. Mar.*, xviii (1927), 87-113. It will be remembered that the author of the *K. al-Istiḳṣā'*, al-Nāṣirī [*q.v.*], has furthermore left behind a history of the family called the *Ṭalʿat al-mushtarī fi 'l-nasab al-djaʿfarī*, lith. Fās n.d.; a résumé of this work has been given by M. Bodin in *Arch. Berb.*, xviii (1927), 87-113. (ED.)

NASKH (A.), or AL-NĀSIKH WA 'L-MANSŪKH, is the generic label for a range of theories advanced in the fields of *Tafsīr*, *Ḥadīth* and *uṣūl al-fiḳh* since a comparison of verse with verse, *ḥadīth* with *ḥadīth*, *ḥadīth* with verse and both Ḳur'ān and *Ḥadīth* with the *Fiḳh* suggested frequent, serious conflict.

That the Prophet's mission had extended over a quarter of a century inspired the idea of gradual development in the details of the regulations introduced in both Ḳur'ān and Sunna. *Naskh* applies to each of the two sources and to the relations between them. Most accepted the *naskh* of the Ḳur'ān by the Ḳur'ān and the *naskh* of *ḥadīth* by *ḥadīth*. The *naskh* of Ḳur'ān by *Ḥadīth* and of *Ḥadīth* by Ḳur'ān raised more delicate issues which divided the scholars.

ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd reports that before he emigrated to Abyssinia, he used to greet the Prophet on passing him at prayer and the Prophet would return his greeting. On his return, ʿAbd Allāh did this, but the Prophet ignored him, and ʿAbd Allāh was perplexed. Completing his prayer, the Prophet explained, "God introduces such regulations as He pleases, and He has decreed that when we pray there must be no talking." In this instance of *naskh* in the *Ḥadīth*, a later regulation has replaced an earlier practice.

The ruling in Ḳur'ān, II, 180, that the Muslim make testamentary provision for parents and nearest kin was thought to have been revoked on the revelation of IV, 10-11, whose rulings allot to the relatives specific shares in a deceased's estate. Many verses counsel patience in the face of the mockery of the unbelievers, while other verses incite to warfare against the unbelievers. The former are linked to the Meccan phase of the mission when the Muslims were too few and weak to do other than endure insult; the latter are linked to Medina where the Prophet had acquired the numbers and the strength to hit back at his enemies. The discrepancy between the two sets of verses indicates that different situations call for different regulations. This is an instance of *naskh* in the Ḳur'ān. Chronology is the key to the resolution of the difference, since a divine book cannot contain contradictions, IV, 82.

The principal component of the general concept of *naskh* is "change", "replacement". To this was joined the notion of "withdrawal", "omission", but solely in relation to the operation of *naskh* upon the Ḳur'ān. The idea had originated in the exegesis. According to interpretation, LXXXVII, 6-7, XIII, 39, XVII, 86, XXII, 52 and II, 106, the last two of which actually employ the term *naskh*, appear to suggest the possibility of Muḥammad's forgetting revelations; the impossibility of his doing so, or divinely controlled forgetting by means of which the divine author would determine the final contents of His Book. The disputed exegeses were precipitated in appropriate anecdotes and the resulting references to "events" in the life of the Prophet consolidated the notion of his forgetting and contributed to the even-

tual shaping of the theories of *naskh*. Of special importance were allegations of actual omissions from the revelation such as those recording the "loss" of a verse in praise of the Bi'r Ma'ūna [*q.v.*] martyrs, the Ibn Ādam "verse" and reports on the alleged originally longer versions of sūras IX or XXXIII, said to have once been as long as sūra II and to have been the locus of the stoning "verse". Lists were compiled of revelations verifiably received by Muḥammad and publicly recited during his lifetime until subsequently withdrawn (*raf'*), with the result that when the divine revelations were finally brought together into book-form, there was collected into the *muṣḥaf* [*q.v.*] only what could still be recovered following the death of the Prophet. The *muṣḥaf* has from the outset been incomplete relative to the revelation, but complete in that we have all that God intended us to have.

Interpretation similarly supplied the impulse behind and the vocabulary deployed in discussions on *naskh*, or the replacement of regulations. Prominent in this regard were the interpretations of Ḳur'ān, XVI, 101, and II, 106. Equation of the term *āya*, used in both verses, with "a Ḳur'ān verse", facilitated the claim that God had declared that "alteration", "substitution", even "omission", would affect the texts. The interpretation could be reinforced by production of what appeared to be numerous instances of actual change. Ḳur'ān, VIII, 66, for example, was held to have been revealed to reduce from ten to two the number of unbelievers against whom the Muslim was required in v. 65 to fight; LVIII, 13, had apparently rescinded the order in the immediately preceding verse to forward a fee in advance of an audience with the Prophet. II, 180 and IV, 10-11, have been mentioned; II, 142-4, in association with II, 150, afforded the clearest indication of the historical change affecting the *ḳibla* [*q.v.*]; XXIV, 2, had replaced the measures introduced in IV, 15-16, to deal with sexual impropriety. Instances of the *naskh* of Ḳur'ān rules adduced in the specialist works are numbered in the hundreds. Sūra IX, 5, for instance, the so-called "sword-verse", alone was thought to have replaced one hundred and twenty-four verses.

The significant fact that II, 106, the chief Ḳur'ānic proof-text, juxtaposed forgetting with *naskh*, interpreted in the light of XVI, 101, to mean *tabdīl* "replacement", led to the formalisation of reported forgetting as a type of *naskh*, the *naskh* of both wording and ruling, where, however, *naskh* retains its XXII, 52, sense of "withdrawal", "suppression". Alleged cases of clash of regulations derived from either Ḳur'ān verses or *ḥadīth*s, could, on the same pattern, be referred to as the *naskh* of the ruling but not of the wording. The formula is hybrid, since *naskh* carries both the sense of "replacement", referring to the ruling and "withdrawal", for the original wording has not been withdrawn.

In addition to the *naskh* of the Ḳur'ān by the Ḳur'ān and the *naskh* of the *Ḥadīth* by the *Ḥadīth*, examples of which we have considered, the majority speak also of the *naskh* of the *Ḥadīth* by the Ḳur'ān and the *naskh* of the Ḳur'ān by the *Ḥadīth*. In the case of the change in the *ḳibla*, the Ḳur'ān states that God had appointed the previous direction of prayer, without, however, identifying it. Some, therefore, saw this as an instance of the *naskh* of Ḳur'ān by Ḳur'ān, whereas, since the Ḳur'ān lacks mention of the earlier direction, others saw it as an instance of the *naskh* of the *Ḥadīth* by the Ḳur'ān. It was argued that there is no real conflict between IV, 10-11, and II, 180. Inheritance differs from testamentary provision and sūra IV regulates both in a single context. But, as a *ḥadīth* attributes to the Prophet the words "There is to be no *waṣiyya* in favour of an heir", many argued that here was an undoubted example of the *naskh* of the Ḳur'ān by the Sunna. The strongest opposition to both principles that the Ḳur'ān could repeal the *Ḥadīth* and that the *Ḥadīth* could repeal the Ḳur'ān is the hall-mark of the source theory developed by al-Shāfi'ī (d. 204/819) which revolutionised *uṣūl al-fikh*. He campaigned tirelessly to justify use of the Sunna as the second primary source alongside the Ḳur'ān against those who would accord the *Ḥadīth* no role in the derivation of the *sharī'a* on the argument that the degree of conflict in the *Ḥadīth*, the inadequacies of the guarantee against corruption, fraud or error afforded by the *isnāds* rendered the *Ḥadīth* unfit for the sacred role of declaring the divine intent underlying the Ḳur'ān's declarations. These opponents being deaf to all but Ḳur'ān evidence, al-Shāfi'ī referred them to IV, 65, XXIII, 73, LIII, 2-3, LIX, 7; to verses linking obedience to the Prophet to obedience to God Himself, III, 132, IV, 80; and to the series of verses which speak of the Prophet's being granted, in addition to the Book, the *Ḥikma*, identified by al-Shāfi'ī as the Sunna. He drives home the point that, in the Ḳur'ān, God imposed upon every Muslim the religious obligation to obey the Prophet as he obeyed God. The only access to knowledge of the Prophet's commands being through the Sunna, al-Shāfi'ī could insist that God, in His Ḳur'ān, had thus imposed on every Muslim unquestioning adherence to the Sunna. Simultaneously, in a parallel confrontation with the Mālikīs and the Ḥanafīs, he sought by emphasising the wording of XVI, 101, "*We* substitute one *āya* for another *āya*", and II, 106, "*We naskh* an *āya*", to impose the view that the *naskh* of a Ḳur'ān verse was an exclusively divine prerogative. As a corollary, he next exploited "We shall bring one better than or similar to it", of the same verse to promote his view that, as nothing could be thought of as superior to or even similar to the Sunna of the Prophet, his opponents' regular procedure of ignoring *ḥadīth*s from the Prophet in favour of reports from Companions and others showed their failure to appreciate the unique status bestowed by God upon the Prophet and hence the special role of the Sunna of the Prophet. Nothing can *naskh* that Sunna save only that Sunna.

He further exploited X, 15, "It is not for me to alter it on my own initiative, I merely follow what is revealed", to argue that Ḳur'ān and Sunna are never in actual conflict. As both come from God, they cannot conflict. The Sunna follows, that is, elucidates the precise intent of the Ḳur'ān, XVI, 44. The Sunna cannot *naskh* the Ḳur'ān. Only the Ḳur'ān can *naskh* the Ḳur'ān and only the Sunna can *naskh* the Sunna.

Theological objections were raised to the theory of *naskh*. Following development of the *i'djāz* [*q.v.*] doctrine, it was argued that, being of divine authorship and hence individually perfect, all Ḳur'ān verses could be said to be similar, but no one could be said to be superior to another. *Naskh* could not, therefore be predicated of the Ḳur'ān. Nor, since the wording was of undoubted human origin, could any *ḥadīth* be thought to be similar, let alone superior to any verse. The *naskh* of the Ḳur'ān by the Sunna could not therefore be posited. The scholars easily evaded this difficulty, as is shown by al-Shāfi'ī's and al-Ṭabarī's regular insistence that *naskh* is not a matter of wording but of rulings. As the ruling of any *āya* could be said to be similar or even superior to that of any other *āya*, so also, the ruling of any *sunna* might be said to be similar or even superior to that of any *āya*. Al-Shāfi'ī's theory of *naskh* is thereby shown to have been short-lived.

As lengthy lists of instances of greater or lesser

incongruity between verses of the holy book had resulted from the efforts of the first exegetes, further theological considerations were urged which rendered necessary a clear distinction between the divine application of *naskh* and the evidence of deficient knowledge or of inadequate reflection suggested by a change of regulation. Merely human knowledge may develop and merely human decisions may be altered but that is inconceivable in the case of divine decisions. The Omniscient knew from all eternity all that would ever happen and when precisely it would happen. That knowledge would render *naskh* unnecessary. This objection made essential a distinction between the divine knowledge and the divine will. *Naskh* is a consciously applied process, planned in advance and intended to be applied to the content of revelation until the process of revelation finally ceased on the death of the last prophet. *Naskh* appears to our deficient human knowledge to be change, *tabdīl*. In reality, it is the announcement by a prophet of the termination of the duration of a regulation and the commencement of the duration of another, whether the earlier regulation was announced by the same prophet or by another prophet. A second objection arose from the view that what is good is commanded and what is evil is forbidden. In prohibiting what had been permitted or permitting what had been forbidden, *naskh* would be to declare good evil and evil good. *Naskh* cannot, therefore be posited as a divine activity. Being concerned with regulations, *naskh* theorising is hostile to the concept of inherent good or evil. The function of divine commands is to test human obedience. That explains why regulations may differ from religion to religion or from period to period. Since men will either be rewarded for obedience or punished for disobedience, God may command what He pleases and prohibit what He pleases. Dependent solely upon the divine will, regulation becomes wholly arbitrary and so may change at any moment. Only what God commands is good; only what He forbids is evil and, as regulation is linked to the divine will and not to the divine knowledge, objections based on the inconceivability of change of the divine mind, or development of the divine knowledge, known as *badāʾ*, inevitably fail. *Naskh* involves only commands which on first institution could have been declared temporary and are such as are indifferently capable of being regulated or of being unregulated. Excluded therefore, are the central tenets of the faith, but also all regulations of the Ḳurʾān expressly stated to be temporary.

To discuss the relations between the two primary sources of the *Fiḳh*, the Ḳurʾān and the Sunna of the Prophet, which, in his discussions on *naskh*, he had rigorously insulated one from the other, al-Shāfiʿī resorted to a technique which he referred to as *takhṣīṣ*, particularisation, actually, alleged exclusion. The sūra IV regulation on sexual impropriety has been mentioned. That had been replaced by the XXIV, 2, flogging penalty. The *Fiḳh* introduced a distinction between adultery and fornication, on which the Ḳurʾān is silent, and assigned the sūra XXIV flogging to the latter sin. For the sin of adultery, the *Fiḳh* decreed death by stoning, thus raising the critical question of its origin. Stoning was rejected by some Muslims, on the grounds that they could not find two penalties in the Book of God. The sūra IV regulations had been flagged as temporary, "or until God appoint a process for these women". Deriving the distinction between fornication and adultery in the difference in tone between the harshness of IV, 15, and the mildness of IV, 16, the majority traced in XXIV, 2, the process promised in sūra IV while they presumed that stoning derived from the Sunna, as documented, for example, in the ʿUbāda *ḥadīth* to the effect that the Prophet had said, "Take it from me! Take it from me! God has now appointed a process for females: the unmarried with the unmarried, one hundred lashes and twelve months' banishment; the married with the married, one hundred lashes and death by stoning". Further reports show the Prophet extending the dual penalties to males, while other reports, in which Muḥammad applied to married persons the stoning penalty alone, were taken to indicate that he had alleviated this element of the penalties by declining to flog in addition to stoning. Confronting the problem, al-Shāfiʿī argued that the ʿUbāda statement was the first revelation to follow sūra IV and was thus its *nāsikh*. The other *ḥadīth*s in which the Prophet did not flog those whom he stoned were simultaneously the *nāsikh* of the ʿUbāda report and the elucidation of XXIV, 2. The Prophet's conduct showed *takhṣīṣ*, particularisation. Flogging is specific to those who are not stoned, those who are stoned being excluded from its provisions. Stoning exemplifies the *naskh* of the Sunna by the Sunna, although al-Shāfiʿī does state that the ʿUbāda *ḥadīth* was an instance of the *naskh* of the Ḳurʾān.

The reply to those who rejected stoning since they could not find two penalties in the Book of God, as indicated by al-Shāfiʿī's teacher, Mālik, was supplied in the statement attributed to ʿUmar that a stoning verse had indeed been revealed to Muḥammad which had been memorised by those in his company and recited as Ḳurʾān in the ritual prayers. The Prophet, Abū Bakr and ʿUmar had applied its provisions and it was merely the fear that he might be accused of adding to the Book of God that inhibited ʿUmar from writing the verse into the *muṣḥaf*. The majority, both before and after al-Shāfiʿī, were satisfied that stoning was one clear instance of the *naskh* of the Ḳurʾān by the Sunna. Al-Shāfiʿī had denied the very possibility yet had failed to resolve the problem of the origin of the *Fiḳh* penalty, justifying Schacht's conclusion that, on this question, al-Shāfiʿī's theory of repeal breaks down.

Later scholars, under the powerful influence of al-Shāfiʿī's theory on the role of the Sunna in relation to the Ḳurʾān and impressed by ʿUmar's claim that a stoning verse had been revealed, formalised stoning as a third type of *naskh*: the withdrawal of the revealed wording but not of the ruling.

It was on quite a separate matter, arising from the exegesis of IV, 23, the precise definition of the number of breast-feedings required to set up a permanent barrier to the marriage of males and females related through having shared a common wet-nurse, that al-Shāfiʿī committed himself to this third type of *naskh*. His normal assiduity to ascertain the Prophet's views on disputed legal matters led him to accept a *ḥadīth* which, however, comes not from the Prophet, but from his widow. ʿĀʾisha declared that God had revealed a Ḳurʾān verse stating that the minimum number was ten; subsequently a second verse was revealed, declaring that the minimum was five and that this second verse was still being publicly recited when the Prophet died. Mālik had drily rejected this report as not being in conformity with the "practice". Al-Shāfiʿī embraced it and made it the basis of his *Fiḳh*. This second instance of *naskh al-tilāwa dūna ʾl-ḥukm* can fairly be attributed to al-Shāfiʿī's attitude.

The third and final instance of this type of *naskh* was contributed by the Ḥanafīs who insisted, on the grounds of a reading attributed to ʿAbd Allāh b.

Masʿūd, that the fast mentioned in V, 89, should be of three consecutive days. This reading was, admittedly, that of a single Companion, but, as the *ḥadīth* from a single Companion was probative, his Ḳurʾān information deserved the same treatment. The ʿAbd Allāh reading was still in circulation in the time of Abū Ḥanīfa, who had adopted it in reaching his conclusion.

Neither *iǧmāʿ* nor *ḳiyās* [*q.vv.*] can repeal. As *naskh* concerns the documents of the Tradition, and as *iǧmāʿ* and *ḳiyās* must be based on a document, it is the document which is the *nāsiḫ*. Besides, neither was resorted to until after the death of the Prophet and after the death of the Prophet, *naskh* is inconceivable, since *naskh* may be effected only at the hands of him by whom the revelation is mediated.

Bibliography: The extensive literature includes the relevant sections of the *tafsīr*s, the special chapters in the *ʿulūm al-Ḳurʾān* and *uṣūl al-fiḳh* works and a large number of specialist studies. For lists of the latter, see Ḥātim Ṣāliḥ al-Ḍāmin, in *al-Mawrid*, Baghdād, vi/1 (1977), 195-6; ix/4 (1980), 481-3. For the first discussion of the principles of *naskh*, see Shāfiʿī, *al-Risāla*, ed. A.M. Shākir, Cairo 1358/1940, 106-46; idem, *K. Ikhtilāf al-Ḥadīth*, in margin of *K. al-Umm*, vii, Cairo 1322-4/1904-6; the oldest systematic work is that of Abū ʿUbayd al-Ḳāsim b. Sallām, *K. al-Nāsiḫ wa 'l-mansūḫ*, ed. J. Burton, GMS, Cambridge 1987; Abū Djaʿfar al-Naḥḥās, *K. al-Nāsiḫ wa 'l-mansūḫ fi 'l-Ḳurʾān al-Karīm*, Cairo n.d.; Makkī b. Abī Ṭālib, *K. al-Īḍāḥ*, ed. Aḥmad Ḥasan Farḥat, Riyāḍ 1976; Hibat Allāh b. Sallāma, *K. al-Nāsiḫ wa 'l-mansūḫ*, Cairo 1379/1960; Muḥammad b. Mūsā al-Ḥāzimī, *K. al-Iʿtibār fi 'l-nāsiḫ wa 'l-mansūḫ min al-āṯār*, Ḥaydarābād 1319/1901; Ibn al-Djawzī, *Nawāsiḫ al-Ḳurʾān*, Beirut n.d.; M. Zayd, *al-Naskh fi 'l-Ḳurʾān al-Karīm*, 2 vols., Cairo 1383/1963; ʿAbd al-Ḳāhir b. Ṭāhir al-Baghdādī, *K. al-Nāsiḫ wa 'l-mansūḫ*, ms. Berlin, Petermann 555. See also ʿAbd al-Mutaʿāl al-Djabrī, *al-Naskh fi 'l-sharīʿa al-islāmiyya*, Cairo n.d.; idem, *al-Nāsiḫ wa 'l-mansūḫ*, Cairo 1407/1987; J. Burton, *The collection of the Qurʾān*, Cambridge 1977; idem, *The interpretation of Q. 87, 6-7*, in *Isl.*, lxii (1985), 5-19; idem, *The exegesis of Q. 2, 106*, in *BSOAS*, xlviii (1985), 452-69; A. Rippin, *Al-Zuhrī, naskh al-Qurʾān and the problem of early* tafsīr *texts*, in *BSOAS*, xlvii (1984), 22-43; Burton, *The sources of Islamic law*, Edinburgh 1990.

(J. Burton)

NASḪĪ [see ḪAṬṬ].

NASNĀS/NISNĀS [see ḲIRD].

NASR (A.) "vulture", one of the five deities said to date from the time of Noah and to have been adored by the people then (Ḳurʾān, LXXI, 23). Ibn al-Kalbī, *Aṣnām*, our sole source regarding this, makes it the idol of the Ḥimyarites, who worshipped it at Balkhaʿ in the land of Sabaʾ (*TA*, iii, 572, at the end, cites al-Djawharī, who says that Nasr was the idol of Dhu 'l-Kilāʿ of the Ḥimyarite country). It was Maʿdī-Karib, of the sub-group of Dhū Ruʿayn, who received it from ʿAmr b. Luḥayy, the first known reformer of the cult in Arabia; he discovered these five idols on the beach at Djudda, where they had become buried since the Flood. At the time of the Pilgrimage, he summoned the tribes to their cults: Ḳuḍāʿa took Wadd, Hudhayl took Suwāʿ, Madhḥidj took Yaghūth, Hamdān took Yaʿūḳ and Ḥimyar took Nasr.

Following A. Jamme, only five South Arabian inscriptions mention the idol's name with certainty: CIS 189, 1; 552, 2; RES 4048, 4; 4048, 2; RY. 196, 2 (*Le panthéon sud-arabe préislamique d'après les sources épigraphiques*, in *Le Muséon*, lx [1947], 130). Moreover, no theophoric name composed with this name has been found amongst the Ḥimyarites and none of their poets mentions it. The only pieces of evidence, apart from those in Ibn al-Kalbī, attesting the existence of a cult of the vulture amongst the Arabs, are found in the *Babylonian Talmud ʿAbda Zara* (tr. Goldschmidt, ix, Berlin 1934, i/3, 468) and in the *Doctrine of Addai* (ed. and tr. Philipps, London 1876, 24).

One should note that the divinity's representation in animal form, lacking in Central Arabia, was fairly current in South Arabia, where Ilumḳuh assumed the form of an ibex, bull, lion and sphinx: ʿAthtar had the antelope and the bull's head as emblems, Saḥar (the dawn) that of the serpent, etc. (cf. G. Ryckmans, *Les religions arabes préislamiques*, 2nd ed. Louvain 1951 [= Bibliothèque du Muséon, 25]; A. Grohmann, *Göttersymbole und Symboltiere auf südarabischen Denkmälern*, in *Denkschriften der kais. Akad. der Wiss. in Wien*, phil.-hist-Kl., lviii/1 [1914], pp. 104).

Bibliography: Ibn al-Kalbī, *K. al-Aṣnām*, ed. and tr. W. Atallah, Paris 1969, 7-9, 43, 48; T. Fahd, *Le Panthéon de l'Arabie Centrale à la veille de l'hégire*, Paris 1968, 132-4.

(T. Fahd)

NASR (A.) masculine noun (pl. *ansur*, *nusūr*, *nisār*) denoting the vulture irrespective of species; the term is cognate with Akkadian *naṣru* which is also encountered in the Hebrew *neṣer* (Turkish *akbaba*, Persian *dāl*, Berber *tamādda*).

From the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean, in the lands of Islam eight species of vulture are known, almost all of them resident and localised in mountainous regions and at the desert fringes. Four of these species are common there, and they are: (a) The Egyptian vulture (*Neophron percnopterus*); this is the *oripelargus* of Pliny which was formerly known as *Catharte alimoch* and Pharaoh's Chicken. Besides its contemporary names of *raḫma* and *anūḳ*, the Egyptian vulture has inherited, according to the locality, numerous nicknames such as *umm ḳays, umm risāla, umm kabīr, umm ʿadjīna, umm ʿadjība, umm djuʿran, umm rakham Allāh, ḥafṣa, ʿuḳāb al-salāwāt*; in Lebanon, it is called *shūḥa*, in Kabylia *isghī* and in Persia *kerkes*. Moreover, the male is called *yarkhūm* and *ʿudmul* and, in Egypt, *firʿawn*; the young in the nest are *naḳāniḳ*. This carrion-eating bird is especially well-known to the Egyptians and is tolerated everywhere on account of its valuable contribution to the cleaning of streets in towns and villages. In the age of the Pharaohs, this vulture, deified and representing the sun, was the object of the greatest veneration; respect for the bird has been retained over the centuries and into the present day. In the 18th century, the English traveller T. Shaw relates (*Voyages*, ii, 91-2) that the Pasha of Egypt at that time donated two oxen every day to feed these vultures, beloved of the city populations.

(b) The Griffon vulture (*Gyps fulvus*), with bright plumage and known as *kishʿām, aklaf, khathak*, in Kabylia *idjidar, gder*; it is confined to mountain ranges.

(c) The Black vulture, Hooded vulture (*Aegyptius monachus*) known as *nasr al-djiwāʾ, satal*. In the Maghrib, it is found only as a winter resident in Morocco.

(d) The Bearded vulture (*Gypaetus barbatus*); this is the *ossifragus* of the Ancient world and, in Arabic, the *kāsir al-ʿiẓām*. It is also lent the names *bulaḥ, bulat, mukallifa, fayna, abū dhaḳan, abū liḥya*, in Kabyle *afalku* (from the Latin *falco*) and in Persian *humā* [*q.v.*].

The four other species are much less common and very localised, especially in the Sudan. These are: (a) The Nubian vulture (*Torgos tracheliotus nubicus*) which is found only in Morocco, in southern Tunisia, in